

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORMAT FOR ACTIONS OTHER THAN HAZARDOUS FUELS AND FIRE REHABILITATION ACTIONS

Mohave County Public Works Santa Maria Road NEPA Number DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2012-0032-CX

A. BACKGROUND

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA 35054

Proposed Action Title/Type: Right-of-way for a road

Location of Proposed Action:

Within sec.8, T. 21 N., R. 18 W., G & SRM

Description of Proposed Action:

The proposed action would be to assign a right-of-way to Mohave County to construct, operate, maintain, and terminate a road on public lands.

On June 3, 2010 Kingman Unified School District #20 was granted a right-of-way to construct, operate, maintain, and terminate a road on public lands described as follows:

Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 21 N., R 18 W., Sec. 8, the West 84 feet of lot 1 north of right-of-way AZAR 34112 (State Route 68), the west 84 feet of lot 4 south of right-of-way AZA 17931 (Chino Drive), the west 84 feet of the SW¹/₄NW¹/₄NE¹/₄NE¹/₄, the west 84 feet of the SE¹/₄ NE¹/₄NE¹/₄.

Mohave County requests an assignment of the right-of-way AZA-35054, except a relinquishment of 34 feet along the entire East boundary of the right- of-way resulting in a right-of-way width of 50 feet. The 34 feet contains a fence for the school. The right-of-way area would be entirely within the existing boundaries of right-of-way AZA-35054. The term of the right-of-way would be modified to perpetual.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

Land Use Plan Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*

Date Approved/Amended: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

LR13a/v: All other minor rights-of-way would be evaluated through the environmental review process and granted on a case by case basis. Existing rights-of-way would be used when possible to minimize surface disturbance.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):
N/A

C. COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 J (9)
Renewals and assignments of leases, permits or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (see Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM2 apply.

I considered the impacts of granting these rights-of-way and there were no extraordinary circumstances with these and, due to the small area affected and the terms and conditions included in the authorizations, there would be no potential for significant impacts.

D. SIGNATURE

Authorizing Official: / s / Ruben A. Sanchez Date: 4/16/2012
(Signature)

Name: Ruben Sánchez
Title: Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this categorical exclusion review, contact Melissa Patriquin, Lands and Realty, Kingman F.O. 2755 Mission Blvd, Kingman, AZ 86401, phone (928) 718-3706.

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the categorical exclusion. See Attachment 2.

Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	No. The proposed action would have beneficial effects to public health and safety by providing ingress and egress to a public school. There are no adverse impacts or significant effects.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	No. Any effects would be within the existing right-of-way and there are no significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographical characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge land; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical area.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	No. The environmental effects would be non-controversial and no conflicts concerning available resources are identified.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No. The environmental effects would be limited to the effects of the existing right-of-way. The assignment would have no significant effects or risks.
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with significant environmental effects.	No. Any future action or decision in principle about future actions would be subject to NEPA.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No. The effects would not contribute significantly to the altering of the this area's natural landscape by incrementally filling it with human created features as long as the threshold deemed as significant is not exceeded.
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.	No. There are no properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places within the project locations.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	No. The effects would not have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for the species.

Attachment 1 Continued: Extraordinary Circumstances Review	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No. The assignment of this right-of-way would not violate any laws or any requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No. The effects of the right-of-way would benefit the public as a whole equally.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	No. This site is not known to be sacred, nor would the assignment of this right-of-way impact access to any ceremonially used Indian sacred sites on Federal lands.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	No. Although non-native plant species may exist in these areas it is not anticipated that the maintenance, operation, or termination of the proposed action would contribute to the introduction or spread of non-native invasive species noxious weeds because the machinery used would be sprayed clean before used on site. No noxious weeds were, and the area of soil disturbance is small.

ATTACHMENT 2 APPROVAL AND DECISION

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Lands & Reality, Melissa Patriquin

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Lands & Reality, Melissa Patriquin

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: / s / Melissa Patriquin **Date:** 4/16/2012

Melissa Patriquin
Project Lead

Reviewed by: / s / Ramone B. Mc Coy **Date:** 4/16/2012

Ramone McCoy
NEPA Coordinator

Reviewed by: / s / Ruben A. Sanchez **Date:** 4/16/2012

Ruben Sánchez
Supervisor

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would be to assign a right-of-way to Mohave County to construct, operate, maintain, and terminate a road on public lands.

On June 3, 2010 Kingman Unified School District #20 was granted a right-of-way to construct, operate, maintain, and terminate a road on public lands described as follows:

Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 21 N., R 18 W., Sec. 8, the West 84 feet of lot 1 north of right-of-way AZAR 34112 (State Route 68), the west 84 feet of lot 4 south of right-of-way AZA 17931 (Chino Drive), the west 84 feet of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, the west 84 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$.

Mohave County requests an assignment of the right-of-way AZA-35054, except a relinquishment of 34 feet along the entire East boundary of the right- of-way resulting in a right-of-way width of 50 feet. The 34 feet contains a fence for the school. The right-of-way area would be entirely within the existing boundaries of right-of-way AZA-35054. The term of the right-of-way would be modified to perpetual.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: <u> / s/ Ruben A. Sanchez </u> Date: <u> 4/16/12 </u> <div style="text-align: center;">Ruben Sánchez Field Manager</div>
--